REMARKS

Claims 1-6 were examined by the Office, and in the final Office Action of June 18, 2008 all claims are rejected. With this response claim 1 is amended, claims 2-6 are cancelled, and new claims 7-11 are added. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the following discussion.

This response is submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

Claim Objections

In section 2, on page 3 of the Office Action, claim 1 is objected to due to informalities. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to claim 1 is overcome by the amendments to claim 1.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 4, on page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Song et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,851,918) in view of Takizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,742,074), and in further view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,160). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, because the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. The cited references at least fail to disclose or suggest that any one of the first and second metallic lines is formed in the same layer of the source line, and the other one of the first and second metallic lines is formed in the same layer of the gate line, as recited in claim 1, because there is no motivation to combine the cited references to arrive at the limitations recited in claim 1.

In Song, the technical problem to be solved is the degradation of the contact formed in the pad region (B) can occur due to contact between the aluminum gate pad (4a) and the ITO pixel electrode (18a). A battery effect generated during development of the mask used to pattern the ITO film can cause portions of the ITO electrode (18a) to melt. In addition, the contact may be further degraded by drive currents arising during operation of the LCD element from an aluminum oxide film on the aluminum contact. Song discloses that this problem can be solved by selectively plating the exposed portion of the gate pad to thereby form a conductive barrier

layer on the exposed portion of the gate pad, or by selectively electroless plating the first conductive region to thereby form a conductive barrier layer on the first conductive region. See Song column 6, lines 5-7; column 8, lines 40-43.

However, the technical problem in Takizawa is that due to electric stresses, such as electrostatic charges that occur in the process of fabricating the thin film transistor and in the process for fabricating the liquid crystal panel, the conducting layer patterns are short-circuited and the characteristics of the thin film transistors are changed. Takizawa discloses a solution whereby a plurality of bus lines for commonly connecting one of the gates and the drains of the thin film transistors. Takizawa states that according to an embodiment the gate bus lines (14a, 14b) are respectively commonly connected to the gate connection lines (24a, 24b). The drain bus lines (16a, 16b) are respectively commonly connected to the drain connection lines (34a, 34b), whereby in the process of fabricating the thin film transistors and the liquid crystal panel, no local charges are present even when electrostatic charges are applied, and electric stresses can be mitigated.

Therefore, the technical problem of Song is different from the technical problem of Takizawa, and a combination of Takizawa with Song would render each reference unsatisfactory for their intended purposes. See MPEP § 2143.01. If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. In contrast, the technical problem to be solved by the present invention is that the peeled metal pieces easily contact each other to cause short-circuiting between neighboring terminals, and thereby short-circuits between neighboring lines frequently occurs, is distinct from the problems addressed by both Takizawa and Song. Therefore, the technical features identified above with respect to Takizawa and Song must be included in each reference in order to accomplish the references' intended purposes. As such, one of skill in the art would not find motivation to modify the cited references to arrive at the limitations recited in claim 1, because the technical features identified above must be included in each respective reference.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited references, because there is no motivation to combine the cited references. Therefore, all of the limitations recited in claim 1, in particular the limitation identified above, are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

The rejection to claims 2-6 is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 2-6.

New Claims 7-11

New claims 7-11 ultimately depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are believed to be novel and nonobvious over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiency required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 20 October 2008

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955